

4

①

CF 2002

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR
CHHATTISGARH

W. P. (S) No. 77 / 2007 7

PETITIONERS

P.R. No. 785816
Presented by AS-2007
dated 27/12/06



1. Smt. Manju Shrivastava, W/o. Shri Nirmal Kumar, aged about 42 years, Assistant Teacher, Govt. Primary School – Danitola, Block – Dondi, Distt. – Durg (C.G.)
2. Chinta Ram Patel, S/o. Paras Ram Patel, aged about 45 years, Assistant Teacher, Govt. Primary School – Nayapara (Limaudih), Block – Dondi, Distt. – Durg (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENT'S

RECEIVED-COPY
Baulcha 27-12-06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

1. State of Chhattisgrh, Through – The Secretary Department of Tribal Welfare Department, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. Commissioner Tribal Welfare Chhattisgarh Govt. Raipur
3. Assistant Commissioner Tribal Welfare Department Distt.- Durg (C.G.)
4. Block Education Officer, Block – Dondi, Distt.- Durg (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION
OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF SUITABLE WRIT, WRITS,
DIRECTION ETC. TO DO JUSTICE IN THE MATTER.

(29)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W. P.(S) No. 77 of 2007

Petitioners : Smt. Manju Shrivastava and another
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

W. P.(S) No. 80 of 2007

Petitioners : Ramkrishna Pandey and another
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others
And

W. P.(S) No. 83 of 2007

Petitioners : Smt. Shakun Manikpuri and another
Versus
Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

SB: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Satish K. Agnihotri, J

Present: Mr. Anil Singh Rajput, Advocate for the petitioner(s).
Mr. Arvind Dubey, Panel lawyer for the respondents/State.

ORDER

(Passed on this 16th Day of January, 2007)

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as for the State/respondents jointly submit that the facts of the present writ petitions are similar to that of in W. P. (S) No. 5976/2006 (Sushil Tiwari and others vs. State Government of Chhattisgarh & others), which was allowed vide order dated 7.11.2006. They further submit that the question of law involved is also the same.
2. In view of the above stated submissions made by learned counsel for the parties, these petitions are allowed in terms of the order dated 7.11.2006 passed by this Court in W.P. (S.) No. 5976/2006 (Sushil Tiwari and others vs. State Government of Chhattisgarh & others). No order as to costs.
3. A copy of this order be placed on record in other connected writ petition.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge